

23 01 2019 Airport Fox

Dr Liam Fox MP
71 High St
Nailsea
Bristol
BS48 1AW

Dear Dr Fox

Re Planning application Ref. No: 18/P/5118/OUT

I am writing to express my objections to the proposal for expansion of Bristol Lulsgate Airport submitted by Bristol Airport limited.

This proposal will bring very little in benefits to North Somerset but in contrast will be highly detrimental to this and surrounding districts and their residents and businesses.

Other than a few predominantly low paid jobs (less than 8% of the jobs at the airport are permanent) the only beneficiary of this expansion will be the owners of the airport the Ontario Teachers' Pension Fund. This organisation which despite claiming to be committed to responsible investment and recognising the potential significant risks of climate change to financial returns continues to aggressively pursue investments in the most polluting and emissions producing industries including Canadian Tar Sands along with several other airport investments.

2016, £35.9 million pre-tax profits on T/O of 89.9 million. 40% Pre tax profit. Industry typical is 16%.

Direct contributions to the local area in 2018 . £108,000. 0.28% of that profit.

Their business model is simple. Big profits from car parking and retail sales. This is essentially an application to build an out of town retail park of equivalent size to the Mall at Cribbs causeway with the exception that the customers will be charged heavily for parking there.

In contrast this development will:

- increase health risks to local residents through increased pollution and noise.
- damage the quality of life of local resident with increased noise levels and more night flyiis.
- severely impinge on the green belt.
- have major negative effects on the local environment and wildlife
- have major negative impacts on the local road infrastructure and consequently local individuals and businesses.
- Increase the burden on local council tax demands

- massively increase carbon emissions, negating all other carbon reduction initiatives.
- Be totally contrary to the NS Council's own sustainable development policies.

Carbon emissions

This development flies in the face of all the other commitments and policies for reduction in emissions needed to combat catastrophic climate change.

The latest IPCC report has clearly and unequivocally given us 12 years to drastically reduce emissions and contain global temperature rises. This proposal completely ignores this and flies in the face of national policy and international agreement alike.

Carbon emissions from vehicles are predicted to rise from 184 kt (184,000 tonnes) in 2018 to 214 kt in 2026 an increase of 32 kt. To put this into context, The Council's policy CS2 requires all new housing developments of 10+ homes to fit 15% renewables, which will produce a total reduction for the 22,000 homes allocated until 2026 of around 6.5 kt. These increased transport emissions will wipe out these housing savings 5 fold. Where is the logic in this?

Air Transport is the fastest growing source of emissions worldwide. The emissions from the aircraft using Bristol Airport are predicted to increase from 746 kt to 1183 kt, an increase of 437 kt. Again to put in context the total reductions of CO2 emissions by North Somerset in the 10 years from 2005 to 2015 was 28.5% or 458 kt (from 1607 to 1149). Emissions from these additional flights will therefore almost completely negate these reductions.

The North Somerset Council in its Climate Local Commitment Update Report 2018 said:

"We recognise that our council has an important role to help our residents and businesses to capture the opportunities and benefits of action on climate change. These include saving money on energy bills, generating income from renewable energy, attracting new jobs and investment in 'green' industries, supporting new sources of energy, managing local flood-risk and water scarcity and protecting our natural environment."

In that document the Council states that:

"The council recognises the need to commit to action on climate change..."

It is recognised that to contain climate change to the agreed levels we need to be making 50% cuts in emissions by 2030 and yet this proposal will INCREASE emissions by that figure by 2026. How can this be in anyway justified so that a pension fund in Canada can make large profits for a few thousand beneficiaries?

The document also restates that the NPPF has in its core principles:

*'to support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change, and **encourage the reuse of existing resources, including conversion of existing buildings** and encourage the use of renewable resources.'*

UK aviation is predicted to grow overall at about 1.5% per annum by the Constrained Capacity model. This equates to less than 13% rise in the 8 years to 2016. This must mean that BAL intends to grow the airport at the expense of other capacity, and so threaten other employment at those locations and additionally create reduced use by facilities already in use. This again flies totally in the face of the NPPF aim of utilising existing resource before creating additional capacity.

Business benefits.

There is no case for this expansion on the basis of business benefits either to the local area or nationally

- Greatly increased traffic flows by traffic from outside the area will cause considerable disruption to local businesses as it will to local residents. This will have a negative impact on many local businesses who also rely on our local infrastructure to operate.
- As the airport is proposing very little in road improvements these will have to be provided by the local authority at our cost.
- As they make a large part of their profits from car parking there is no incentive to develop better public transport links in order to encourage people out of cars.
- The current use of the airport by business customers is about 16.5% of all passengers i.e . 1.3 million of the total of 8.4 million. The current spare capacity of 1.6 million is therefore enough to more than double the business use.

Green Belt

The green belt is protected from just about every other form of development but this application proposes to swallow up even more of the Green Belt for its "Low Cost Parking"

The airport has not yet even fulfilled the requirements of the previous expansion agreements to increase the provision of multi-storey car parking and yet they wish to develop even more on open land.

Even housing which is desperately and truly needed is not being allowed in Green Belt land but this purely commercial adventure does not seem to recognise or respect such crucially important principles.

In addition, due to the high prices charged for parking in order to maximise profits, we have had to suffer numerous illegal parking operations on other local sites and

worst of all, cars left parked in our villages and lanes. Having our residential roads further cluttered by these cars is totally unacceptable but totally uncontrolled.

Health

Air quality

The huge increase in flights and traffic will only further degrade the air quality in both the vicinity of the airport and also the surrounding districts.

Bristol City already has very poor air quality right on the limit of WHO minimum standards and the further increased road transport and aircraft movements encouraged and created by this development can only further degrade that situation. It is estimated that around 300 deaths occur in Bristol each year due to NOx and particulate pollution. (BCC 2017 Air Quality Annual Status Report).

Noise The increased noise will also have a further impact on local residents.

"The health effects of environmental noise are diverse, serious, and because of widespread exposure, very prevalent (Basner et al, 2014). For populations around airports, aircraft noise exposure can be chronic. Evidence is increasing to support preventive measures such as insulation, policy, guidelines, & limit values. Efforts to reduce exposure should primarily reduce annoyance, improve learning environments for children, and lower the prevalence of cardiovascular risk factors and cardiovascular disease (Basner et al, 2014)." Aircraft Noise Effects on health Clark et al 2015.

In addition to the large increase in daytime flights the application also seeks to change the night flying conditions which will effectively increase the number of night flights though optimisation and also create more irregularity. All this is damaging to health and very hard to live with especially in the summer when windows need to be opened and the exposure noise levels are far higher.

Passengers

Over 83 % of all passengers are leisure travellers. Not essential business of other critical needs but holidays. This expansion is to attract even more leisure use as they are the customers with discretionary spending who will use it in the shops and other retail outlets which is the true purpose of the development.

We are awash with policies and initiatives to get people out of their cars and into public transport and other modes of travel but when it comes to the airport, nothing. Where are the serious efforts to encourage use of trains (75% to 90% less carbon intensive) instead of air? And for this airport where are the policies and initiatives to develop significant public transport options for those who continue to use the airport.? As mentioned above it is contrary to the interests of the owners to do this but where are N S Council in this? Why do you not insist on not only that they fulfil

their promises to build proper MS car parks but also to develop offsite parking with public transport links to reduce the already congested roads?

Economic Growth

This proposal like most others claims justification in that it will add to economic growth, that growth is always lauded as a good thing and the answer to achieving greater prosperity and happiness. But in a finite world this is a nonsense. (See "Limits to Growth", 1972 Meadows et al. and "Limits to Growth, the 30 year update", Meadows et al and numerous other books papers and articles.)

When will this airport be big enough? When does growth end and true sustainability begin? When it covers twice the area, or all of North Somerset? Or when climate change creates the sort of chaos and disruption and final realisation that we can't continue to grow aviation indefinitely on a predict and supply basis, i.e. predicting a continued increasing demand that allows development that is then FORCED to deliver greater capacity to meet the prediction?

The only significant growth that this development will deliver is in the already considerable profits of the OTPF, and certainly not in the economies of Wrington and North Somerset.

Finally the application process and the Council's assessment.

This application runs to over 5000 pages and must have taken thousands of hours by numerous staff and consultants, using considerable resources, financial, legal, technical and political to produce.

Do the Council have the expertise and the resources to properly deal with this major, highly technical, and hugely contentious application? And if not do they have the money to employ enough people of sufficient ability and knowledge to do this? What is the budget for this process?

This proposal will affect a much larger area and far more people than just North Somerset and should be considered and decided by that wider community.

Finally this huge application was submitted on 19th December just at the time when it would be least noticed and with a deadline for objections by Jan 26th. The public, with minimal resources and little expertise, have been given a mere 25 working days to read, digest and respond to this huge document. The only conclusion to be drawn is that at best the airport are trying to slip this one in under the radar and hoping that this will avoid proper oversight and debate or at worst are totally and utterly cynical and contemptuous of both local opinion and their obligations.

I am asking that you, as our elected Representative in parliament, to represent in every way possible our interests against serious negative human, environmental and economic effects and to allow full and proper debate and response. To date this has been seriously lacking.

This deadline for comment should be at the very least extended by a long enough period to allow proper consideration by the people who this will affect most.

In short this proposal is in the interests only of the airport owners and its executives and if it goes forward will be to the detriment of the local area, the local population and the wider region

To support this application completely ignores the health and wellbeing of the local and wider populations, the local UK and world environment and practically every local and national policy on sustainable development in favour of the narrow interests and considerable profits of an extra national commercial company.

Ontario Pension Fund short term greed or local, national and global long term need?

I trust that as OUR representative you will consider this application long and hard, and call it in.

Yours sincerely